

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignita 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,328	02/15/2001	Kazuhiko Nobe	Q63117	3179
7	7590 08/28/2003			
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC			EXAMINER	
	SYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. TON, DC 20037-3213		JONES, SCOTT E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3713	17
			DATE MAILED: 08/28/2003	18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		,			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/783,328	NOBE ET AL.			
·	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Scott E. Jones	3713			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 05 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a)					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	ENTE	CRED AND			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
Other: Other: Teresa Walberg Supervisory Patent Examiner Group 3700					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the examiner believes the combination of Sagawa et al. (E.P. 903,169 A2) and Olmedo (U.S. 6,174,170) renders claims 1-8 and 11-13 obvious. Additionally, the examiner believes the combination of Sagawa et al., Olmedo, and Ng (U.S. 6,328,570) renders claims 9-10 obvious.

SEJ